

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# JOINT COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

---

Secretariat:  
Rm. 351A, Admin. Bldg.  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Washington, D.C. 20250

PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION USERS ADVISORY BOARD  
AND THE JOINT COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

July 15-16, 1980

and

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
JOINT COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES  
MEETING, JULY 17, 1980  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

Joint Council Members Present:

Anson R. Bertrand, Cochairman  
John S. Robins, Cochairman  
A. R. Baldwin  
Lawrence Bogorad  
Richard Farley  
John L. Gerwig  
Mary Nell Greenwood  
Clare Harris  
Mark Hegsted  
R. J. Hildreth  
Allan Johnson  
John P. Jordan  
Marshall Levin  
Richard D. Morrison  
Susan Oace  
Harold Robinson  
Robert Lee Scarborough  
Elwood Shafer  
Richard A. Skok  
Charles Smallwood  
W. I. Thomas  
James Nielson, Executive Director  
Susan G. Schram, Executive Secretary

UAB Members Present:

John R. Ragan, Chairman  
Ellen Haas, Vice Chairman  
Ralph S. Abascal  
W. Henry Anthony, Sr.  
Roberta Archer  
Harriet Barlow  
Margaret Eklund  
Raymond T. Floate  
Barbara F. Meyer  
Leon S. Minckler  
John A. Pino  
Robert Lee Scarborough  
Janet Schwartz  
Stoney M. Stubbs

Others Present

Tom Adams, House Agriculture Committee

John M. Brazzel, USDA/SEA

Mark Buchanan, Western Director-at-Large,

State Agricultural Experiment Stations

Sheila Gillette, USDA/SEA

James Halpin, Southern Director-at-Large,

State Agricultural Experiment Stations

Clare Harris, USDA/SEA

Holly Hexter, Higher Education Daily

Allan S. Johnson, USDA/ESCS

Jerry Jorgenson, House Agriculture Committee

M. D. Levin, USDA/SEA

Omer Kelley, Office of Technology Assessment

Charles Kraenzle, USDA/SEA

John Mahlstedt, Iowa State University

Michael Phillips, Office of Technology Assessment

Gilbert Porter, Chairman, Northeast Regional

Council

Boyd Post, USDA/SEA

John Stovall, USDA/SEA

Larry Summers, USDA/SEA

Reverend Richard Whale, United Methodist Board of  
Church and Society

1. On Tuesday evening, July 15, 1980, the National Agricultural Research and Extension Users Advisory Board and the Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences shared a social hour and dinner. Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., Chairman of the House of Representatives' Science and Technology Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology and member of the House Agriculture Committee, addressed the groups after dinner. The topic of his presentation was, "Agricultural Science: The Challenge of Change."

In his comments Congressman Brown noted:

- That the United States is entering a challenging era in most social and economic sectors as the post-World War II boom, based on the assumptions of limitless resources, confronts the very real limits to those resources.
- That the Congress, USDA, and other major institutions of a mature society frequently see great threat in change and adopt reactive stances to challenge, returning to past assumptions, past solutions, and the short-range focus of daily responsibilities. In such a setting, the work of the Joint Council and the Users Advisory board, having the advantage of detachment from political accountability, is critically important to anticipate fundamental changes needed and to help set longer range research and extension agendas.
- Among priority items needing basic, new thinking are the effects of increasing fossil fuel prices on the structure of agriculture. What will happen, for example, when the cost of transporting a California tomato to New Jersey equals the cost of raising tomatoes in New Jersey?
- Other areas of priority should include: Energy production from agricultural products, water resources problems, soil erosion, changing patterns of farmland ownership, integrated pest management systems, and exploration of alternate farming systems.
- Recognize that Federal research dollars are high risk funds that do not require direct economic return as does private investment and should therefore be found on the fringes of existing knowledge. Public funds should also focus on areas left untouched by commercial interest, the so-called public good issues.
- Agricultural science sector is failing to make its case with Congress and OMB. Those concerned about the future of agriculture must reverse the erosion of support for agricultural research that has occurred in recent years. The Board and the Council should help build a new constituency in urban areas to replace the loss of support farm families once provided for agricultural issues.



WORK GROUP SESSIONS OF THE JC AND UAB  
Wednesday, July 16, 1980

2. John R. Ragan, Chairman of the Users Advisory Board, and John S. Robins, Cochairman of the Joint Council, served as Cochairmen for the joint meeting.
3. Cochairman Ragan called the meeting to order and welcomed Board and Council members and guests to the meeting. In reviewing the day's agenda, he noted that the objectives for this joint session were:
  - To provide members of both groups opportunities to make individual acquaintance.
  - For both groups to share their perceived roles and responsibilities regarding research and extension planning and policy.
  - For both groups to share views on research and extension needs and priorities and exchange mutual feedback.
  - For both groups to jointly explore separate and mutual interests and needs.
4. Cochairman Ragan asked Dr. James Nielson, Executive Director to both the Board and the Council, to brief the joint session on the first meeting of the Agricultural Mechanization Task Force, which he cochairs. Dr. Nielson reported that the Task Force had spent much of its two-day meeting reviewing Departmental information on mechanization research and discussing the nature of criteria and procedures for use in making decisions on the use of Federal funds for mechanization research.

The Department's charge to the Task Force is to provide advice to USDA on the following:

- A set of criteria for use by relevant agricultural research administrators and managers in making decisions on the use of Federal funds for agricultural mechanization research.
- Procedures to be used by agricultural research administrators and managers in making decisions on mechanization research.
- Minimum amount of information and analysis needed to implement the criteria, and processes to be used by agricultural research administrators and managers in judging the social, economic, environmental, and labor force impacts of a research project (i.e., committee to advise Secretary and Task Force as to its concerns and how they should be used).

Dr. Nielson noted that in charging the Task Force, Deputy Secretary Jim Williams made clear that it is not the job of the Task Force to set Departmental policy, but only to advise the Department on elements and criteria for making decisions regarding USDA research programs. While such decisions will apply directly to USDA in-house efforts, the criteria and procedural guidelines will be shared with the Department's cooperating partners who would hopefully devise similar standards for their work.

5. Cochairman Robins noted that both the Board and the Council had significantly expanded their activities during the past year and suggested that each group briefly report on its progress.

In reporting on the Joint Council's work, Cochairman Robins noted:

- The Joint Council has developed its planning structure including establishment of all regional councils and appointment of interim national committees.
- The Council published a five-year needs projection entitled Areas of Emphasis in the Food and Agricultural Sciences in the Early 1980's.
- The Council published reports in the areas of Human Nutrition and Small Farms to help improve coordinated planning.
- The Council studied national planning cycles and published the report, 1979-84 Cycle for Projecting and Analyzing Research Program Adjustments with Historical Trends and Comparisons.
- In the coming year, the Council expects to focus attention on programs in energy development and use and on the linkage of existing and developing management information systems to a common program structure.

In reporting on the Board's work, UAB Chairman Ragan noted:

- That the extreme diversity in the interests represented by Board members had presented the Board with a challenge in learning how to function effectively as a group, articulating collective user-interest priorities while maintaining individual differences in perspective. The Board feels it has made great progress in this area.
- The Board published its 1979 report to Secretary Bergland setting forth users' priorities. The report was well received with nearly 3,000 copies being requested for distribution.
- Through a formal Departmental response, the Board engaged USDA in a somewhat detailed dialogue on its priorities. This appears to be having an effect on Federal plans and budgets.
- The Board published its 1980 reaction to the President's budget and submitted the report to the President and Congress.
- The Board has come to see its role as that of providing independent opinions which articulate needed issues for discussion and define areas for and stimulate public debate. The Board will seek to be more assertive in that direction during the coming year.

- The Board is well into preparation of its 1980 report to Secretary Bergland and expects to address the allocations of responsibilities and funds among those performers represented on the Joint Council in stating its priorities.
6. Cochairman Robins then charged five work groups made up of members of both groups to discuss their understandings and perceptions of the implications of some of the areas of UAB priority as expressed in the Board's 1979 report and to discuss jointly felt needs. The work groups subsequently reported their discussions as follows:

A. Basic research:

- Basic research concerns must reach beyond production to food marketing, conservation, and consumption and should embrace public and private sector performers. Further, "basic" needs to be defined in order to show the linkage between acquiring new knowledge and developing new technology.
- There is need to better identify where basic research capabilities exist and are strongest in the entire research system.
- There is need for study to determine an optimum basic research/mission research expenditure ratio.
- There was feeling that the currently most neglected area for both basic and applied research is that of postharvest technology.

B. Nutrition:

- The application of nutritional and other trade-offs in making crop choices should extend beyond production-choice decisions alone to include marketing, distribution, and other decisions.
- There is need for more research on the interrelationships of various nutrients and on nutrient requirements. There is need to improve current standards for determining desired nutritional status.
- The members of this joint work group expressed strong support for the USDA/HEW Dietary Guidelines and cited need for study of conflict between current nutrition and health recommendations and current research and extension spending and policies.
- There is need not only to assist less developed countries to improve human nutrition research capability and food self-sufficiency, but to do likewise within the regions of the U.S.
- There is need to study and expand development of urban nutrition education centers.



## C. Structure of the food and agriculture system:

- The group noted that the UAB recommendations focus only in a narrow range of the full spectrum of structural concerns.
- There is need to expand the Green Thumb pilot information program to help farmers respond to economic complexity.
- There is need for increased research and extension work to improve food and fiber product price competition.
- There is need to increase market study and get information to users faster and better.
- There is need to greatly increase the amount of work regarding the various forms of farm ownership.
- There is need for differentiation between various categories of family farms and for corresponding targeting of research and education programs.

## D. Energy:

- There is need for improved study of future energy needs, including analysis of current use patterns.
- There is "great urgency" for increased "hands on" education and demonstration of known alternative energy sources for food and agricultural uses.
- There is need to improve extension education programs to inform users of advantages and trade-offs involved in various energy conservation practices.
- There is need for increased work to identify and implement practices to reduce petroleum uses in food and agricultural processing.
- There is need for increased study of energy effectiveness measures for local versus concentrated production of various commodities.
- There is increasing need for improved energy effectiveness of food storage and effectiveness for consumers.

## E. Food security:

- Food security is both a domestic and a world issue, and there is need to assess the adequacy of U.S. food production and supplies in light of the world food situation.

- There is need to recognize that while in some instances food crises may result from real inadequacies in food supply, food crises may more often be the result of world price and distribution situations which make food unavailable to significant numbers of people in spite of overall adequate supply levels. While research and extension efforts are needed in both areas of cause, emphasis is needed on distributional factors.

7. The joint session was addressed following the luncheon by Dr. A. R. Chamberlain, President, Colorado State University, and Chairman of the Board, NASULGC. The topic of his presentation was: "The University-Government Partnership in Stress." In his comments, Chamberlain noted:

- No other department in the Federal government has a partnership that is more economical or has been more effective in the long term than the USDA Land-Grant partnership. In today's world it is also important for the state universities and Land-Grant colleges to develop linkages to other key departments of the Federal government including the Department of Energy, Department of Interior, Department of State.
- We must remember that the USDA Land-Grant partnership is built upon mutual respect for the strengths of each component of that partnership. It has been weakened in the last decade by competition for financial support between one component of the partnership and the other, and Federal-State conflicts. Neither of these should intrude into the University-USDA relationship.
- The partnership has also been weakened by the fact that the Federal government has provided primarily program support and little institutional support to the major research universities. The Federal government should recognize its role in the maintenance and replacement of outdated facilities and equipment, and institutional support, as well as program support.
- The USDA Land-Grant partnership model is basically sound, but some fine tuning is needed. The university community should do a better job of moderating among the numerous competing needs of the University-State-Federal partnership and help more in setting priorities. Also, the university must do better in communicating the values of such vehicles as Bankhead-Jones, BIFAD, complementary competition grants, etc.

If we will do this, the impact of the partnership in the last fifth of this century could be the most successful in the history of the partnership.

8. Cochairman Ragan charged the four afternoon work groups to discuss the roles and responsibilities of both groups and to report on how each can contribute to improved mutual effectiveness. The work groups reported their discussions as follows:
  - The UAB is seen as providing an important and valuable linkage between users and performers. UAB-identified priorities and alternatives to established procedures are valued by the Council. Accordingly, Council members suggest that increased UAB participation in top level discussion and decision making is desirable, and that the UAB should seek broader communication with user constituencies represented in its membership.
  - The Council is viewed as providing identification of priority problems and issues so that various performers' efforts will be strengthened or modified so as to achieve priority needs. UAB members suggested as a high priority, that the Council develop a cross-agency inventory of research and extension programs and that efforts to improve communications with users are increased.
9. Cochairmen Robins and Ragan complimented the members of both groups on their productive discussions and adjourned the joint meeting.

Joint Council Meeting (following joint UAB/JC meeting)

1. Presiding Cochairmen: Anson R. Bertrand and John S. Robins.
2. Updates
  - James Nielson, Executive Director, announced that four professionals will be working three-fourths time on Joint Council/Users Advisory Board matters in addition to the Executive Director and Executive Secretaries (as per Title XIV legislation): Larry Summers, ESCS; Paul O'Connell, FS; two additional SEA/JPE employees to assist with staff work and planning and coordination activities.
  - Susan Schram, Executive Secretary, reported that a brief brochure describing the functions and responsibilities of the Joint Council has been completed. Multiple copies are available from Room 351A, USDA Administration Building, Washington, D.C. 20250.
  - Anson Bertrand, Cochairman, informed the Council about progress of the 1981 SEA budget and stated that USDA Science and Education agencies will present their 1982 budget requests to the Secretary starting the week of July 21. Bertrand emphasized that SEA has attempted to present a coordinated budget this year, factoring in the priorities list generated by professional societies, COP groups and others, and coordinating with other USDA action agencies.



- Bertrand informed the Council that the USDA report, "Report and Recommendations on Organic Farming," is available and has been reviewed in Science magazine and the Wall Street Journal. He requested that the Executive Secretary distribute copies of the report and the Science magazine review to Joint Council members.
- 3. The Proceedings of the April 16-17, 1980 meeting of the Joint Council were approved as corrected.
- 4. Executive Committee Report

Cochairman Robins reported that the Executive Committee met May 14 and June 11 and discussed the following issues:

a. Evaluation

Following the April Joint Council evaluation workshop, the Executive Committee deliberated further on the evaluation responsibilities of the Joint Council. The Committee requested that Mike Brazzel, SEA Program Analysis Staff, discuss alternative Joint Council evaluation strategies with the Council at the July Joint Council meeting.

b. Program Structure

- At its April meeting, the Joint Council decided to appoint (1) a program structure staff group and (2) a management information systems staff group.
- Following extensive discussion at both the May and June meetings, the Executive Committee requested that the Executive Director appoint only the program structure staff group at the present time. This group will develop alternative recommendations for an overarching program structure for the agricultural science and education system and will address the linkage of existing and developing management information systems to such a program structure.
- Program structure staff group members subsequently appointed include:

Walt Fishel (Chairman), Ohio State University  
Paul O'Connell, FS (JPE)  
Tom Tate, SEA/TIS  
Bob Marshak, SEA/JPE  
Alan Bird, ESCS

This staff group will report to the Council through the Program Structure Study Group chaired by George Sledge. A report is anticipated in approximately six months.

c. Discussion with House Agriculture Staff

At its June meeting, four members of the House Agriculture Staff met with the Executive Committee. The House feels the Joint Council has done a good job overall. The House favors the competitive grants program and believes action is needed in the research facilities area. Tom Adams, House Agriculture Staff, cited a concern on the Hill for the degree to which the science and education system is moving away from production research. This may be reflected in the revision of Title XIV.

d. Title XIV Legislation

The Joint Council will provide input in October regarding revisions of the Title XIV legislation. The Executive Committee requested that a brief staff paper be developed to serve as a discussion piece for the July Joint Council meeting with lengthier discussion to be planned for the October meeting of the Council

e. Integrated Pest Management

The IPM Committee (John Mahlstede, Chairman; Gordon Guyer; Homer Folks; Keith Shea) has been encouraged to work with regional IPM committees in planning regional IPM conferences and also to plan a national conference in line with action taken by the Council in July 1979. SEA will provide \$20,000 in support of this effort if needed.

f. Manpower Assessment Study

A small committee of the Joint Council reviewed and gave pre-publication input to Jane Coulter, Acting Assistant Director, Higher Education (SEA), regarding the report, "Graduates of Higher Education in the Food and Agricultural Sciences: An Analysis of Supply/Demand Relationships."

g. Publication on Planning and Coordination Functions of the Joint Council

This document has been recently revised by James Nielson. It is intended for use by Regional Councils, Joint Council Committees, and anyone interested in the planning and coordination functions of the Council. Joint Council comments on the publication should be forwarded to James Nielson by August 1.



#### h. Action on North Central Regional Council Items

The North Central Regional Council adopted two resolutions at its February 29 meeting and forwarded them to the Joint Council for consideration. The Executive Committee took the following action:

- The proposal that a human nutrition representative be added to the Interim National Research Planning Committee was referred by the Executive Committee to the Interim National Research Planning Committee for their consideration in making recommendations on the permanent National Research Committee.
- The proposal that the Joint Council support the CARET (Committee on Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching) recommendations for the FY 81 budget was referred by the Executive Committee to the Committee on Joint Council Strategies for further deliberation.

#### i. Technology Assessment

- At the May Executive Committee meeting, the Steering Committee on Technology Assessment proposed that a pilot assessment be conducted during FY 1981 on either corn (single-commodity approach) or soil and water management (cross-commodity approach); that the completed pilot study be critiqued and presented to the Joint Council to decide whether to proceed with a larger study; and that the steering committee be authorized to recruit a senior scientist to lead the pilot assessment and coordinate the critique of that assessment.
- The Executive Committee recommended that the Technology Assessment Committee develop a detailed proposal, determine if a scientist is interested in working on the project, and, in light of current USDA budgetary restrictions, consider alternative sources of funding for this project.

#### 5. Annual Report Committee

- Richard Skok, Committee Chairman, reviewed a proposed outline and schedule for completion of the 1980 Annual Report of the Joint Council.
- Skok reported that the Annual Report Committee and the Executive Committee recommend a small number of high priority themes for this year's report. Specific program themes suggested for 1980 (including research, extension, and higher education) are: (1) Increased productivity and efficiency in agriculture, (2) Energy use and production, (3) Natural resources conservation and use, (4) Human nutrition. Council members also suggested emphasizing accomplishments

in integrated pest management, small farms, manpower assessment, acid precipitation and discussing redirection of program efforts.

- Discussion pointed to the importance of addressing the issues raised by the Users Advisory Board report and advocating research on the effects of policy alternatives related to each of the issues.
- Council members approved the proposal of the Annual Report Committee pointing out that this approach will focus the efforts of the Joint Council and allow the Council to come forward with definitive recommendations.

6. Joint Council Structure for Planning and Coordination

a. W. I. Thomas, Chairman of the Steering Committee for Planning and Coordination, reported the following progress in putting in place the Joint Council structure for planning and coordination:

- All four Regional Councils are now in place and functioning.
- Recommendations have been made to the Executive Committee regarding alternatives for membership of the permanent National Research Committee.
- Interim committees for teaching and extension have been organized to recommend permanent membership for these two national committees.
- J. S. Robins added that the Committee on Joint Council Strategies will be addressing the question of managing the total planning and coordination structure.

b. National Research Planning Committee Membership

- J. S. Robins reported that the Executive Committee has deliberated on three alternative membership plans for the National Research Committee, and after seeking the opinion of the Regional Councils recommends the following membership for the National Research Committee to the Joint Council:

- Five USDA representatives:

Three SEA

One Forest Service

One Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service

- Five University Representatives

Four State Agricultural Experiment Station representatives  
to be named by ESCOP

One 1890 representative

- One Agricultural Research Institute representative
  - One Veterinary Medicine representative
  - One Home Economics representative
  - One American Association of State Colleges and Universities representative
  - One Association of State College and University Forestry Research Organizations representative
- It was suggested that a representative from Association of American Universities be added and also that Extension and Higher Education be directly represented on the committee to assure reciprocity among the three Joint Council national committees.
  - It was moved, seconded, and passed that the National Research Committee will be composed of the following:

- Five USDA representatives:

Three SEA

One Forest Service

One Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service

- Five University representatives:

Four State Agricultural Experiment Station representatives  
to be named by ESCOP

One 1890 representative

- One Agricultural Research Institute representative
- One Veterinary Medicine representative
- One Home Economics representative

- One American Association of State Colleges and Universities representative
  - One Association of State College and University Forestry Research Organizations representative
  - One Association of American Universities representative
  - One Higher Education representative
  - One Extension representative
- } to be appointed by the  
respective permanent  
national committees
- c. The Joint Council granted endorsement to the Executive Committee to appoint National Extension and Teaching committees as soon as the Executive Committee receives recommendations from the interim committees. If Executive Committee consensus is not apparent, the various recommendations will be brought before the Council in October.

7. Comments from Regional Council Chairmen

- Gilbert Porter reported that the Northeast Regional Council met in May. They addressed the formation and roles of the three regional functional committees and discussed regional priority concerns. The Northeast Council will meet again in January.

8. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy

- Chairman J. P. Jordan reported that the committee now includes himself as chairman; Gale VandeBerg (ECOP); C. A. Pettibone (RICOP); Warren Doolittle (FS); Bille Hougart (SEA); with staff support provided by Eilif Miller (SEA-CR) (staff coordinator), Glenda Pifer (SEA-E) and Andrew M. Cowan (SEA-AR).
- The committee hopes to accomplish several key tasks in the ensuing months:
  - a. An in-depth review of current programs within and outside the USDA related to the issue of energy and agriculture.
  - b. Considerations of structures and management and coordination mechanisms that would maximize the productivity of energy-related efforts within and external to the USDA.



- c. Identification of new programs and structures for the future, and development of supporting data that could obtain appropriations for energy program areas authorized by Title XIV.
- d. Examining the longer range view relevant to "tomorrow's agriculture."
- Jordan shared that the committee has already completed a first draft listing of 32 USDA energy-related programs accompanied by a directory of key actors in those programs, and a similar compilation about Department of Energy agriculture-related programs.
- As the committee queries other organizations concerning their energy programs, they are inviting key actors to a September coordinating conference. This will hopefully lead to a document identifying effective mechanisms for coordination of energy programs within and external to the USDA.
- The energy committee is coordinating efforts with the task force developing a SEA energy plan and with NASULGC committees.
- Anson Bertrand informed the Council that the USDA's energy office has been dismantled and within the next 10 days the Secretary will reassign parts of the total energy spectrum to the various existing agencies. The Joint Council might want to have input into these decisions.
- J. P. Jordan moved that the Joint Council express concern to the Secretary of Agriculture about the adequacy of information and demonstration facilities necessary as a prelude to an energy loan program for farmers and ranchers; and recommend that the information and dissemination components be assigned to the appropriate science and education agencies. The motion was seconded and passed.

#### 9. Research Facilities Study Update

- Mark Buchanan, Cochairman, Research Facilities Study, discussed an executive summary of the Agricultural Research Facilities Study to be published as a report of the Joint Council.
- He proposed that there be a relatively short national report that would highlight the results of the facilities survey; comment with respect to the results; and refer to the availability of complete state and location data, data on the "Single Most Needed New Research Facility or Facility Improvement," and data on major unique collections.
- Extensive Council discussion indicated that before the report is sent to the Hill, it is crucial that further analysis, interpretation, and Joint



Council recommendations be added to the statistical information. The Executive Committee and the study groups will continue to move forward to resolve questions raised by Council members.

10. Integrated Pest Management Committee Report

- John Mahlstedt, Chairman, reviewed the historical background of the Joint Council IPM Committee and current status of the Regional IPM Coordinating Committees.
- He reported that in April 1980 correspondence, the Joint Council Cochairmen, on behalf of the Joint Council, encouraged regional and/or national symposia to improve coordination of IPM activities and pledged that SEA would contribute \$20,000 in assistance of these efforts. Mahlstedt shared that regional committees feel, however, that these funds should be made available to regions on an equal basis to be used for travel and refinement of regional IPM programs.
- It is Mahlstedt's opinion that existing IPM networks should be encouraged to cooperate in a national, high visibility conference such as that proposed by the American Chemical Society in FY 81. The conference should be structured to provide widespread participation, address present constraints and strengths, identify solutions to turf problems and describe methods for enjoining Federal agencies to a common commitment to IPM.
- The IPM Committee report was accepted with thanks by the Council

11. 1890/Minority Joint Council Committee Proposal

- Anson Bertrand reported that there has been significant discussion over a period of time indicating that the Joint Council should acknowledge a special obligation to minorities. The Executive Committee discussed the issue and is recommending that the Joint Council establish a standing subcommittee with the responsibility of attending to minority affairs in the food and agriculture system.
- The Council approved the motion that a three-person subcommittee of Joint Council members be appointed to examine what action the Council might take in this area and eventually report those ideas to the Executive Committee and the Council.

12. Follow-up on Evaluation

- As follow-up to the April Joint Council evaluation workshop, Mike Brazzel, Program Analysis Staff, SEA, outlined possible evaluation strategies to fulfill the program evaluation functions of the Joint Council.

- Brazzel reviewed a brief paper citing the Title XIV Congressional directive to the Council regarding evaluation, the status of evaluation in the food and agricultural sciences, a statement of evaluation functions, and alternative evaluation activities for the Joint Council.
- Brazzel also pointed out that few comprehensive studies of environmental, social and economic impacts of research and extension programs in the food and agricultural sciences have been done to date, and that resources for evaluation are limited.
- J. S. Robins reported that the Executive Committee, following deliberation on Dr. Brazzel's report to them, recommends the following to the Council:
  - a. That a small committee of Joint Council members and alternates be assigned a leadership role to guide the Council in fulfilling evaluation responsibilities stipulated in Title XIV.
  - b. That this study group would develop a report for the consideration of the Joint Council that identifies:
    - (1) Program evaluation issues the Joint Council should consider
    - (2) Alternative Joint Council activities in the evaluation area and
    - (3) A mechanism by which program evaluation studies and findings can be incorporated in the national and regional planning and coordination process of the Joint Council.
  - c. That the evaluation study group will be asked to report to the Council with a plan encompassing and/or expanding upon the above.
- The Council approved the appointment of the evaluation study group.
- Evaluation study group members subsequently appointed include: Charles Smallwood (Chairman), Kenneth Carpenter, Walter Armbruster.

### 13. Title XIV Legislation Considerations

James Nielson presented a series of questions developed at the request of the Executive Committee regarding the revision of the Title XIV legislation for Joint Council consideration. Council members will respond to the questions by mail by August 4, and there will be lengthy discussion of this issue at the September Executive Committee meeting and the October meeting of the Joint Council. The Executive Committee will also elicit the opinion of constituent groups in the system in preparation for its position statement.

### 14. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Joint Council will be held October 14-16, 1980.



